#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 460

32

EA 003 688

AUTHOR TITLE Gunn, Cyrus L; And Others Indiana State Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1970 (School Year 1969-1970): Title I, ESEA.

INSTITUTION

Indiana State Dept. of Public Instruction,

Indianapolis.

PUB DATE NOTE

70 60p.

EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS

EDRS Price MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, \*Compensatory Education, Delinquent Rehabilitation, \*Disadvantaged Youth, \*Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, \*Program Evaluation, Remedial Mathematics, Remedial Reading Programs, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher

Education, Test Results

IDENTIFIERS

\*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA

Title I, Indiana

## ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from interviews with selected personnel from the Indiana Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, State ESEA Title I personnel, and university personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff and university consultants; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. (Pages 16, 28-31, and 38-40 may reproduce poorly.) (EA)



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

EDUCATION & WELFARE

OFFICE, OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TIDE I, EDG

STATE ARRUAL EVALUATION A PORT Fiscal Tear 1970 (School Year 1969-1970)

STATE OF INDIANA

OFFICE OF STAIL SUPERENTERDENT OF FUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Richard D. Wells State Superinvendert of Public Instruction

Gerald Carmony
Assistent Superintendent
for Austriatration and Finance

Prepared by: Division of Federal Projects

Cyrus L. Conn, Director

Ardis G. Sanders, Evaluation Consultant

Frances Marp, Consultant

Phil Jackson, Consultant

EA 003 68

# INDIANA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT, TITLE I, ESEA FISCAL YEAR 1970

#### CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Basic State Statistics	1
II.	SEA Staff Visits	4
III.	Changes Made by the SEA in the Last Three Years	8
IV.	Effect upon Education Achievement	10
V.	Effect of Title I Programs	46
VI.	Additional Efforts to Help the Disadvantaged	48
VII.	Compensatory Education Brought to Nonpublic Schools	49
VIII.	Coordinated Teacher-Teacher Aide Training Programs	50
IX.	Community and Parent Involvement	55

# INDIANA LEA EVALUATION REPORTS

- 1. Indianapolis Tutorial Reading Project
- 2. West Clark Community Schools Reading Project
- 3. Indianapolis Programmed Remedial Mathematics Project
- 4. East Chicago Junior Police Project
- 5. School City of Mishawaka Remedial Reading Project



# 1. Basic Stare statistics:

۸.	Total number of operating LEA's in the State 30	5
в.	Number of LEA's participating in Title I	2
	(1) during the regular school term only 8	1
	(2) during the summer term only 2	5
	(3) during both the regular school term and the summer term	6
c.	Number of Title I programs	۷;
D.	Unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs	7
	(1) enrolled in public school	Z,
	(2) enrolled in nonpublic schools	
NOT	TE: The above do not include the four joint projects in the Sta	te
	or the three institutions for neglected and delinquent chil	dren.

The following are lists of Title I Instructional and Supportive programs, along with the number of LBA's participating in each type of program.

NAME OF PROGRAM	NUMBER OF LEA	
Instructional		
Art	34	
Business Education	<i>l</i> ,	
Cultural Enrichment	08	
Language Arts	107	
Home Recommends	6	
Industrial Arts	1.4	
Kindergerten	2	
Mathematics	342	

# State Evaluation Report

# Pape 2

NAME OF PROGRAM	. NEGELE OF LIA's
Instructional Services	
Music	24
Physical Education, Recreation	75
Pre-Kindergarten	(1
Reading	355
Science	27
Social Studies	28
Special Education for Handicapped (not including Speach Therapy)	83
Speech Therapy and Hearing	58
Vocational (other than Business)	8
Work Study	10
Other:	
Environment Education	G
Field Trips	6
Camping	2
	1,083
Supportive Services	
Attendance Services	20
Curriculum Materials Center Services	Ľ,
Food Services	6)
Guidance/Counseling	98
Health Services (Nurse)	157
Library Services	83
Psychological Services	45
·	



NAME OF PROGRAM	KLADIE OF TIVE
Supportive Services	
School Social Work Services	35
Transportation Services	96
Other Services	8
	607

NOTE: If a school had a program in regular school and the same program in summer school, it was counted as two programs.

11. BUY staff vicits to the latte time! ers:

Visits by the SEA staff to DEA's were of the following types: planning or development of programs: program review or operation; pregram eviduation; e.d. workshops, inspervice training meetings, and other coefficiences.

A total of 143 individual staff visits were made to schools baving Title I projects during the 1970 Fiscal Year. Fourteen workshops or conferences were conducted by SEA staff during the same period.

Following is a convery of the visits, including their surposes and effects upon the devilopment, or ration, and evaluation of the local projects.

A. For planning or development: 50 School Visite--apprenimately 35% of the total number.

These visite were made to posist the LEA's in completing their applications, and in most cases, they were made at the request of the LEA prior to submission of the application. An SEA staff member occasionally made a visit of this kind after receiving a Tirle T application occurring inconsistencies or mistaken applications of guidelines.

A record of each visit was placed on file.

Visits to sid in planning or developing a program helped to bring about a mutual understanding, and often a lessening, of problems confronting the LEA that was endeavoring to satisfy guideline requirements while meeting unusual educational needs of its children.

The SEA staff member was able in some instances to assist the LEA in making a new appraisal of the educational needs of its low income children, resulting in an improved version of the criphen) application.

Staff members brought book with them a greater knowledge or the educational needs of the LEA's and, in addition, a better understanding of the effects which may guideline changes might have on the LLA's.



Page 5

B. For program review or operation: 72 School Vinite insproximately 50% of the total number.

Visits for review of the project were not usually made to those LFA's which had been visited during development of the program. Since it was not possible to visit all programs in operation, very often those which were chosen had unusual characteristics or components, such as an unusually effective tutorial program or a program built around a particularly effective remedial reading technique. Programs which were not as effective or desirable were also visited, so that improvements right be made.

These visits provided the SEA with direct information concerning the use of different techniques so that the most successful once right be used to improve other programs. They also provided an opportunity to determine whether existing guidelines and regulations were relevant to the problems facing the LEA's.

Some projects were modified so that they might better serve educational needs of the children, or so that the project would continue to meet guidelines.

Such visits also served to introduce LEA and SUA personnel to each other. Assured of the concern and intenest of the SEA, the LEA felt free, perhaps more often than before, to contact the State office whenever any questions or problems arose.

C. For evaluation: 21 School Visits--approximately 15% of the total number.

A visit for the purpose of evaluation was made as the project was mearing its completion date, unless the LEA requested an earlier visit so that a continuous evaluation might be made during the school year. Such visits were initiated by both SEA and LEA concerning evaluation procedures



7

Brane Lyabortion Levelt Page 6

and recults, with priority usually fiven cited to those LFA's displaying pursually difficulty projects or to those having unusual difficulty assessing their programs.

These visits usually resulted in excellent evaluation reports, since the SEA gained a more thorough and personal luowledge of the program and the LEA pained a better understanding of evaluation requirements of the SEA.

After such visits, it was often possible for the LEA, for use in developing future programs, to assess factors other than those measured in the valuation report to the SEA. This might include assessment of planning procedures, use of the staff, and relevance of the program to the needs of the children concerned.

In visiting progress which were proving to be effective, the SEA became acquainted with the rationale of the LEA in developing the progress and could then assist LEA's with less successful progress to overcome weaknesses within their projects.

- D. Workshops, conferences, and in-service training programs: 16 group meetings. These 14 meetings included the following:
  - (1) In-service training sessions at LEA's. These concerned the use of teacher sides.
  - (2) Area workshops. Among other subjects, these concerned the use of aides, and interpretation of guidelines, accountability, and comparability.
  - (3) Conferences on comparability.
  - (4) Follow-Through Workshop.
  - (5) Evaluation Workshop.

8

Although the SLA conducted these worldbops and conferences, various LFA steff presented successful techniques and procedures used in Title I projects which they had developed.

One very profitable result of such conferences, aside from the original purpose of providing information covering a special area, was that they afforded an opportunity for dissemination of information on a variety of other subjects.

Workshops and conferences, for whatever reason they were held, gave the LFA's in attendance an opportunity to ask specific questions relating to their own programs, thus often avoiding mistakes or delays in planning programs or in making applications.

At such meetings, also, the SEA learned more about the kinds of information most often requested by the LEA's. Better procedures were then developed to suswer questions from the LEA's and thereby assist them in handling their problems.



# III. Commented by the SIA in the last times years:

- A. Changer have to improve the quality of Title I projects:
  - (1) All Title I projects are reserved to curricular and other appropriate specialists for review. A report on their quality is made to the Title I office. Also, these specialists are made browledgeable of the Title I aspects of their speciality and are expected to work with the LEA's to improve the appropriate components of Title I project. This procedure has had the effect of improving the quality of the planning, operation, and evaluation of Title I projects.
  - (2) LEA's have been encouraged to reduce the number of target schools in order to concentrate Title I funds on fewer educationally disadvantaged enildren. This procedure has bed the effect of increasing the impact of the Title I program in terms of the amount of money available for each eligible child.
  - (3) An increase in the size of the Title I staff has permitted better coverage of the State for the monitoring of Title I programs. Schooleden for visits have been developed, as well as a reporting system for the recording of the results of program reviews.
  - (4) Through workshops and visits to Title I programs, the sophistication with which Title I programs have been developed has been increased, resulting in better quality programs.
  - (5) Librarians and library sides have been eliminated from Title I programs because program reviews revealed that, for the most part, there were being used in a general manner rather than concentrating on Title I children. The effect has been to release these funds for other economents of a Title I project. Many LEA's have continued librarians and library sides with State and local funds.



- B. Changes made to insuve proper participation of nonpublic school children:
  - (1) The SEA has insisted upon the involvement of nempublic schools in the planning, operation, and evaluation of Title 1 projects in accordance with OE guidelines. This is not a change in procedure but rather one of emphasis.
  - (2) In program reviews, nonpublic schools are visited as well as the public schools in order that programs provided in those schools by the LEA might be observed.
  - (3) Evaluation of the effectiveness of Title I programs extended into nonpublic schools has been made the responsibility of both the LEA and the nonpublic schools. The effect has been to increase the awareness of teachers, both in the LEA and in the nonpublic schools, of the educationally disadvantaged child in the nonpublic school.
- C. Changes made to modify local projects in the light of State and Local evaluation:
  - (1) Workshops on the techniques of evaluation have been consucted so that the objectives are more clearly stated and measured and the modification of programs based upon the above can be made.
  - (2) There has been considerable encouvagement of continuous evaluation and changes in techniques and programs, as well as the establishment of basic line data for terminal evaluation.
  - (3) Through workshops and inclusion of evaluation costs in Title I programs, an increase in sophistication of evaluation techniques has been experienced on both the local and State levels.

#### IV. Effect upon Education Achievement:

Various testing, survey and research procedures are used to determine the continued progress of the Title I ESEA projects in Indiana. The results from the objective and subjective methods tend to provide a complete picture for total evaluation. This report is confined to the objective data in the reading area based upon standardized testing results in cooperation with the participating local school systems, public and private.

Comprehensive evaluation is a vital part of the program. Both pre- and posttesting are administered by certified reading specialists. The objective results serve as a diagnostic teaching tool as well as providing an accurate method of evaluation.

Proper testing procedures are used throughout the program under the direction of professional personnel to assure complete realiability and validity. Indiana testing norms are established by the norms used in the various testing instruments. Local norms are often established by the local school districts.

To gain a composite evaluation, five regions are designated as "target areas."

These target areas represent a cross section sampling of the State's projects,

and an analysis of these samplings gives an accurate objective status evaluation.



#### A. Reading data Title I project

#### State Evaluation Target Area #1

This section of the reading evaluation is an analysis of the standardized testing results representing the one area of the state. This
report is composed of a sampling which accurately reflect the area's
progress based upon objective instruments. The area's sampling involves
approximately 1,946 students participating in Title I programs. The
evaluation was based upon pre- and post-tests results from The Metropolitan Elementary Reading Test, The Stanford Diagnostic Test, The Metropolitan Achievement Test, and basal textbook objective tests results.

#### SUMMARY OF DATA

#### I. RESULTS OF METROPOLITAN ELEMENTARY READING TEST

Length of Exposure: 7 Months

		Pre-Test Mean		Post-Test Mean	<u>Mean</u> <u>Gain</u>
Grade 4	N=13	2.9	N=10	3.6	+.7
Grade 5	N=21	2.7	N=17	3.7	+1.0
Grade 6	N=11	2.4	N=5	4.0	1.6

#### II. RESULTS OF STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC TEST

Length of Exposure: 8 Months

		Pre-Test Mean		Post-Test Mean	<u>Mean</u> Gain
Grade 4	N=225	2.3	K=198	2.9	.6
Grade 5	N=234	2.9	N=207	3.5	.6
Grade 6	N=190	3.2	N=168	3.7	.5



#### II. GINN I TEST SCORE RESULTS

## Pre-test

Test	Mean Exp.	S Cont.	Diff.	t p Score		nce* res Cont.	Chance** Scores	Total Possible
N	100	39						
Metropolitan Reading Readiness (1-4)	19.3	19.8	<b>-0.</b> 5	0.3 N.S.	51.0	51.3		
<b>Al</b> phabet	4.3	4.2	0.1	0.1 N.S.				
Ginn Recall	0.4	0.9	-0.5	1.3 N.S.				
Post-test		·						
N	100	39						
Alphabet	22.8	16.7	6.1	3.3 .01				
C Recall	11.0	6.1	4.9	5.6 .00	)1			
Pre-primer	24.5	18.4	6.1	4.4 .00	1.0	15.4	9	36
Primer	47.8	33.1	14.7	4.9 .00	3.0	30.8	21	75
First Reader	54.6	40.4	14.2	4.5 .00	12.0	23.1	29	105
Pre-primer + Primer Total	72.3	51.6	20.7	5.1 .00	1.0	15.4	30	111
Pre-primer, Primer, and First Reader Total	126.8	92.0	34.8	5.1 .00	)1 <b>1.</b> 0	15.4	59	216
Metropolitan Achievement Test Total (1-4)	83.8	64.6	19.2	3.7 .00	)1			

<sup>\* &</sup>quot;% Chance Scores" is the number of subjects whose score is less than or equal to that score which would be obtained if every question had been answered by quessing divided by the number of subjects in the group.

<sup>&</sup>quot;Chance Score" is that score which would be obtained (in the "long run") if every question had been answered by quessing only; e.g., for a 100 question test, each question with four alternatives, the chance score would be 25.



Page 13

#### III. EXPERIMENTAL STUDY RESULTS

Pretest	Ро	sttes	t
Exper. Control Diff.  Metropolitan19.32 19.7947	Exper. 83.83	<u>Control</u> 64.64	Mean Diff. 19.19
Ginn Recall	10.96	6.08	4.88
Alphabet 4.25 4.18 .07	22.76	16.69	6.07
Ginn Pre-Primer	24.50	18.44	6.06
Ginn Primer	47.77	33.13	14.64
Ginn First Reader	54.57	40.44	14.13
Ginn Pre-Primer and			
Primer Total Score	72.27	51.56	20.71
Ginn Pre-Primer, Primer, and			
First Reader Total Score	126.84	92	34.84

N=100 for Experimental Group N=33 for Control Group

# CONCLUSION

In light of the stated objectives the evaluation data does tend to indicate successful results. These reading surveys show that, provided the opportunity, the deprived child can show significant progress. These positive results are reflected by gains made by participating pupils in the reading skills in vocabulary and comprehension.



#### State Evaluation Target Area #2

This part of the reading evaluation contains the results of sampling from the second representative area of the state. Approximately 1,242 tests results were studied for this portion of the evaluation.

#### SUMMARY OF DATA

I. The data listed below shows a comparison of ending first grade percentile scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test of tutored children from target area schools, post-matched with untutored children from non-target schools, by identical readiness scores in September 1969. The significant difference in achievement is graphically illustrated for comparison. The tutored group scored from 37.8% to 108% above the non-tutored group. The percentile improvements per matched readiness percentiles were as follows:

Met. Readiness Mean Percontile	Met. Achievement Mean Percentile NON-TUTORED	Met. Achievement Mean Percentile TUTORED	Percent of Improvement
3	22.2	47.6	53.3
11	21.5	51.0	57.8
13	54.7	75.4	37.8
17	23.5	38.9	65.5
20	37.5	61.0	62.6
25	36.7	76.4	108.0
39.6	39.6	69.6	75.7



Page 15

II. METROPOLITAN READINESS PERCENTILE SCORES, SEPTEMBER, 1969, IN COMPARISON WITH METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT SCORES, MAY, 1970

Percentiles	Achievement Scores			Totals
_	1.0-1.4	1.5-1.9	2.0+	
			<del></del>	
31 or above		18	9	27
26 to 30		8	12	20
21 to 25	2	7	4	13
16 to 20	4	18	11	33
11 to 15	4	17	7	28
6 to 10	4	32	5	41
0 to 5	13	37	8	58
Totals	27	137	56	220

III. The following data presents a comparison of tutored students' percentile scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test with the mean grade achievement scores on the Reading sub-tests of the Metropolitan Achievement. Tests were administered to first grade students in May, 1970, at the end of first grade. The percentile score gains of the ending Metropolitan Achievement compared to the beginning percentile scores on the Metropolitan Readiness are further shown according to schools in the listing below.

Survey Groups	Metropolitan Readiness Percentile Mean - Sept., 1969	Metropolitan Achieve- ment Percentile Mean May, 1970	Mean Percentile Gain
Group A	12.9	72.6	59.7
Group B	12.7	39.5	26.8
Group C	13.0	44.5	31.5
Group D	12.0	46.0	36.0
Group E	8.0	37.3	29.3
Group F	10.8	33.6	22.8
Group G	18.6	32.3	13.7

IV. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

MEAN PRUTHET AND FOSTIEST GAZES-MEGGINITIE MEADING TEST SCORES OF REMEDIAL READING STUDENTS BY CRADES (REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR)

Grade	Number of Students	Mean IQ*	Mean Roading Score (September)	Moon Reading Score May)
2	141 .	88.9	1.2	2.2
3	185	91.3	1.7	2.7
Ĺ;	153	86.6	2.3	3.0
5	170	89.1	3.0	4.0
6	120	91.0	3.6	4.5
7	75	86.5	4.3	5.0
3	40	80.3	4.5	5.6
TOTAL	884	89.1	2.6	3.5

From school record or Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

Name of Test			For	m Pre-Test	Form Po	st-Test	Grade
Gates MacGinitie	Reading Tes	t B		1	2		2nd
Tune of Title I Reading	ng Activity	(check	88 7	nany as appl	y)	أدسية الله ومواهية القام مواهد بالمهاد	
None x Spec x Reac x Teac	her	x Summer Remedial Reading x Special Reading Materials x Expanded Library Facilities Other, (specify)					
Pre-Test	Pre-Test Results					sults	
Date of Test	Date of Test Number of Pupils			Date of	Test	Number	of Pupils
September 1969	171				970	·	.68
Mean Grade Equivalent			Ì	Mean Grad	de Equivale	ent	
1.3					2.2		
Number of Pupils by P National		tegori	es	Number of		, Percenti nal Norms	le Categories
Below 25th 26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-	99th	Below 25th			h 76th-99th
Not available				·			
e of Test			Fo	rm Pre-Test	Form Po	st-Test	Grade
1	Donding Too	. C		1 2			3rd
Gates MacGinitie Type of Title I Readi			as	many as app			
x Spe x Rea	e Provided cial Remedia ding Consult cher Aides		her	x S	ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lil ther, (spec	ding Mater orary Faci	cials
Pre-Test	Results			. Р	ost-Test R	esults	
Date of Test	Number o	•	ls	Date o	Ī		of Pupils
September 1969	12	2.5		May 19	70		121
Mean Grade Equivalent				Mean Gra	de Equival	ent	
2.0				3.1			
Number of Pupils by F		tegori	les	Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th 26th-50th		76th-	-99 <b>t</b> h	Below 25th			th 76th-99th
Not available							

Name of Test	<del></del>		Fo	rm Pre-Test	Form Po	st-Test	Grade
Gates MacGinitie R	eading Test	1		D-1M D-3M 4t			4 <b>t</b> h
Type of Title I Readin	g Activity	(check	as 1	nany as app	ly)		The state of the s
None  X Spec  X Read  X Teac	her	x Sy x Ex	oecial R <mark>ea</mark> d	iial Readir ling Materi prary Facil cify)	lals		
Pre-Test	Pre-Test Results				ost-Test Re	sults	
Date of Test	Number o	f Pupi	1s	Date of	f Test	Number o	of Pupils
September 1969	135	•			1970	137	
Mean Grade Equivalent				Mean Grad	de Equivale	ent	
2.7					3.7		
Number of Pupils by Pe National	es	Number of		Percenti	le Categories		
Below 25th   26th-50th		76th-	99th	Below 25th			76th-99th
Not available							
The of Test	*		<b>T</b> O	rm Pre-Test	Form P	ost-Test	Grade
		ļ	10				
Gates MacGinitie Type of Title I Readin			as :	D-1M	D-3M		5 th
None Spec Read	Provided cial Remedia ling Consult cher Aides	l Teac		_x S _x S _x E	ummer Reme pecial Rea	dial Readi ding Mater brary Faci cify)	ials
Pre-Test	Results			Р	ost-Test R	esul <b>ts</b>	
. Date of Test	Number o	f Pupi	ls	Date o	f Test	Number	of Pupils
May 1969		45		May 1970		46	
Mean Grade Equivalent		. —		Mean Gra	de Equival	ent	
3.3	····		- المالية من والمساورة المالية		4.4		
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
	51st-75th	76th-	99th	Below 25th			h 76th-99th
Not available					·		

20

Trond Sepre | some forty cont

#### VI. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

# The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test

		Pre-test	Post-test
Grade	# of Pupils	Mean Grade	Mean Grade
2	171	1.3	2.2
3	125	2.0	3.1
λ,	137	2.7	3.7
5	46	3.3	4.4

#### CONCLUSION

The results in the various objective surveys tend to indicate reading improvement by those children participating in the Title I Project. The standardized tests results compared the ending first grade percentile scores of tutored children from target area schools, post-matched with untutored children from non-target schools, by identical readiness scores. The results of this survey reflected the general degree of other surveys in this target area. The tutored group scored from 37.8% to 108% above the non-tutored group.

#### State Evaluation Target Area #3

A total of approximately 2,897 participating children's tests results were examined in this Title I target area. Various grade levels were given pre- and post-testing in reading and basic achievement skills to provide an accurate and objective study.

# SUMMARY OF DATA

## I. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

MEAN AND MEDIAN SCORES OF IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS PARTS A AND B GIVEN IN TARGET PUBLIC 3CHOOLS IN GRADES 4 and 6 COMPARED TO LOCAL AND NATIONAL NORMS

		Voca	nbulary	Reading Comprehension		Voca	abulary	Reading Comprehension	
		Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Group 1		3.3	3.2	3.7	3.55	5.0	5.2	4.9	4.8
Group 2		3.6	3.7	3.6	3.55	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.15
Group 3	1	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0	5.7	5.8	5.5	5.2
Group 4	+	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.6
Group 5	<b>,</b>	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	5.3	5.4	5.2	5.1
Group 6	•	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.25	5.2	5.1	5.3	5.1
Group 7	,	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.0	5.9	6.0	5.6	5.5
Group 8	}	3.7	3.6	4.0	4.1	5.6	5.8	5.5	5.55
Group 9	)	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.8	4.8	4.85	4.7	4.8
Group 10	)	4.2	4.05	4.3	4.3	6.2	6.4	5.6	5.6
Group 11		4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	5.6	5.8	5.8	5.85
Group 12	2	3.0	2.6	3.0	2.6	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.4
Target		3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	5.5	5.4	5.4	5.4
Local		4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4	6.3	6.5	6.1	6.2
National		4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7



Name of Tes	t		Fo	rm Pre-Test	Form Po	ost-Test	Grade	
Iowa Tes	t of Basic	Skills	Part	4 A (Vocabula	anv)		4	
			(check as	many as app.	ly)			
	None Provided  X Special Remedial Teacher  Reading Consultant  X Teacher Aides  Summer Remedial Reading  X Special Reading Materials  Expanded Library Facilities  Other, (specify)							
Pre-Test Results Post-Te					ost-Test Re	esults		
Date	of Test	Number o	f Pupils	Date of	f Test	Number	of Pupils	
April, 1	970	76	2				·	
Mean Grade				Mean Grad	de Equival	ent		
	4.4							
Number of F	upils by Pe		tegories	Number o			le Categories	
Below 25th	National 26th-50th		76th-99th	Below 25th		nal Norms   51st-75t	h   76th-99th	
		0.250 / 30.11						
342	228	132	60	·				
me of Tes	t of Basic S	ikilla	1	orm Pre-Test	ĺ	ost-Test	Grade 4	
L				B (Reading		<del></del>		
	None None Spec	Provided ial Remedia ing Consult her Aides	ıl Teacher	× Si	ummer Reme pecial Rea xpanded Li ther, (spe	ding Mater brary Faci	ials	
	Pre-Test	Results		P	ost-Test R	esults		
Date	of Test	Number o	f Pupils	Date o	f Test	Number	of Pupils	
April, 19		76	2					
Mean Grade	Equivalent		•	Mean Gra	de Equival	ent		
	3.					in the second constitute the second constitute to		
Number of f	upils by Fe National		itegories	Number o	- · · · · ·	y fe <b>r</b> centi nal Norms	le Categories	
Below 25th		51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th			h 76th-99th	
370	214	107	71					



# II. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Page 22

Name of Test				roi	m Pre-lest	FOIM FO	ost-lest	Grade
Iowa Test	t of Basic	Skills	r'a:	rit .	Λ (Vocabula	rv)		6
of Title	e I Readin	g Activity	(check a	18 D	any as appl	Ly)		
	X Spec	Provided ial Remedia ing Consult her Aides		er	× Sp	oecial Read opanded Lib	iial Reading iing Materia orary Facil:	als ities
	Pre-Test Results				Po	ost-Test Re	esults	
Date of Test Number of Pupils				,	Date of	f Test	Number o	f Pupils
March, 19 Mean Grade E	<del></del>	67	3		Mean Grad	ie Equivale	ent	
5.5								
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				3	Number of		y Percentilo	e Categories
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99	9th	Below 25th			76th-99th
349	173	105	46					
e of Test		0.11			rm Pre-Test		ost-Test	Grade
Type of Titl	of Basic e I Readin				B (Reading nany as app			
	x Spec Read	Provided ial Remedia ing Consult her Aides		er	× S <sub>1</sub>	pecial Rea	dial Readin ding Materi brary Facil cify)	als
	Pre-Test	Results			Po	ost-Test R	esults	
Date o	of Test	Number o	f Pupils	3	Date o	f Test	Number o	f Pupils
March, 19		68	7		Wasan Carr	1 - P d 1		
Mean Grade F	equivalent 6.1				mean Gra	de Equival	ent	
Number of Pu		rcentile Ca	itegories	3	Number o	•	y Percentil nal Norms	e Categories
Below 25th		51st-75th	76th-99	9 <b>t</b> h	Below 25th		51st-75th	76th-99th
; 394	174	95	24					



#### CONCLUSION

In the evaluation analysis the tests results, particularly in the concentrated reading projects, indicated growth considerably beyond that which might otherwise have been expected. The local norms of the participating schools compared favorably with the national norms. These comparisons showed reading improvement with gains in vocabulary and comprehension skills.



## State Evaluation Target Area #4

This evaluation area compares the results of the post-tests to the results of the pre-tests. Grades one through seven are included in an objective study of reading comprehension and vocabulary development.

Approximately 3,590 tests results represent a composite picture of this state evaluation target area.

# SUMMARY OF DATA

#### I. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Te	est SRA Achievement Series	Grade
	Reading Comprehension	1

Group 1								
Test Results								
1	13.53							
Date of Test Number of Pupils								
April 197	0		882					
Mean Grade Equivalent								
		1-8						
Number of P	•	by Pe cional		tegories				
Below 25th	26t1	1-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th				
251	2	277	205	149				

Group 2									
Test Results									
	10.95								
Date of Tes	t	. N	umber of Pu	pils					
April 197	0		882						
Mean Grade Equivalent									
		1-9							
Number of P	-	-	rcentile Ca Norms	tegories					
Below 25th	26th-5	0th	51st-75th	76th-99th					
210	210 277			183					



# II. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Paso 25

T.							
Name of Tes		rement Sorie		rm Pre-Test	Form Po	st-Test	Grade
	Reading Co	omprehension	1	D		)	2.
be of Tit	le I Readir	g Activity	(check as	шиий яв врр	ly)	the color and co	men free areas in a some of their investment and a service and the
`	None	Provided		c		ttal Doaddan	~
		ial Remodia	ıl Teacher			lial Reading ling Materia	
		ing Consult				rary Facil:	
	X Teac	her Aides				:1fy)	
	ok dalikuskirani	-		erina di santa da san	-		
	Pre-Test	Results		P	ost-Test Re	sults	
		13.08			00.01		
Date	of Test		of Pupils	Date o	22.91 f Test	Number o	f Pupils
March, 1	1969		731	America	1070		·
Mean Grade				April,	de Equivale	1,0	12
Ticali orace	•	_		mean Gra	de Equivale	:110	
Number of 6		. <del>-</del> 7		ļ		2-7	
Number of F	Pupils by Pe National		itegories	Number o		r Percentilo al Norms	e Categories
Below 25th	26th-50th		76th-99th	Below 25th			76th-99th
202	242	155	120	077	21.0	000	
202	242	155	132	273	342	223	174
me of Tes				rm Pre-Test	Form Po	st-Test	Grade
•	Reading V	vement Seri	es	D	D		2
Type of Tit	le I Readin		(check as	many as app			
1	~~~~	Provided	.1			lial Reading	
		ial Remedia ing Consuli		<ul><li>x Special Reading Materials</li><li>x Expanded Library Facilities</li></ul>			
		her Aides			ther, (spec		LULUS
<u> </u>			<del></del>				
	Pre-Test	Results		P	ost-Test Re	sults	
	1	1.10		-	18.6	8	
Date	of Test	Number o	of Pupils	Date o	f Test	Number o	f Pupils
March, 1	969	731		April,	1970	1,012	2
Mean Grade	Equivalent			Mean Gra	de Equivale	ent	
	1-9					3-4	
Number of A	upils by Pe		tegories	Number o			e Categories
Below 25th	National 26th-50th	Norms 51st-75th	76th-99th	Relaw 25th		nal Norms   51st-75th	176th-99th
DC102 25 CH	20011 30011	JISC-/JUIL	70011-77011	DE10# 25011	LOCK-JOER	1 2130 / 7011	70011-79011
163	231	173	164	260	323	243	186
L	L	<del></del>	<del></del>	<del></del>	<del></del>	<del></del>	<del></del>



III. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test

Name of Tes			1	For	m Pre-Test	Form Po	st-Test	Grade	
		vement Sorie				D			
e of Tit	le I Readin	omprehennion g Activity	(check	80 0	nany as sop			3	
٠.		•				•			
	None	Provided	1 maast		S1		ial Reading		
		ial Remodia		ner.			ing Materia rary Facili		
		her Aides				ther, (spec	-		
	Pre-Test	Results		1	Po	ost-Test Re	sults		
	23.59	)		l		26,81			
Date	of Test	Number o	f Pupi	ls	Date of	Test	Number of	Pupils	
March	1969	832	?	j	April	1970	987		
Mean Grade	Equivalent		·			de Equivale			
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories					Number o	f Punila ha	3-3 Percentile	Categories	
National Norms						Nation	al Norms		
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-9	99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	
								}	
212	275	215	130		286 <sup>.</sup>	281	196	224	
	<u> </u>						1	227	
me of Tes			·	F 0 :	rm Pre-Test	Form Oc	st-Test	Grade	
me of les	SRA Achie	vement Seri	es	ro.		FOLM FO	ost-lest	Grade	
		ocabulary			D	D		3	
Type of Tit	le I Readin	g Activity	(check	as i	many as app	1 <b>y</b> )			
ĺ	None	Provided			Sı	ummer Remed	iial Reading	2	
	Spec	ial Remedia		her	x Special Reading Materials				
	The Property Laws	ing Consult	ant		Expanded Library Facilities Other, (specify)				
ł	_x_ reac	her Aides				cher, (spec			
	Pre-Test	Results	<del></del>		P	ost-Test Re	sults		
	18	.55				18.53			
Date	of Test	Number o	of Pupi	ls	Date o		Number of	f Pupils	
			•				2.2	_	
	h 1969	83	2		April Maan Cra	<u>1970                                    </u>	98		
Mean Grade		ta .			nean Gra	ae raar			
3-4				<del></del>	3-4				
Number of A	Pupils by Pe National		ategori	es	Number o		y Percentile nal Norms	e Categories	
Below 25th		51st-75th	76th-	99th	Relow 25th		51st-75th	76th-99th	
273	263	1.78	118		338	317	117	215	
			1		<u> </u>			213	



i I				טא	rm Pre-Tent			Grade				
SRA Achievement Series					<b>D</b>		.ue)					
Reading Comprehension					D 11							
pe of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)												
	21	0										
		Provided	1				lial Readin					
}		ial Remedia		her			ling Materi					
		ing Consult	ant				rary Facil	ities				
ĺ	_x_ Teac	her Aides			0	ther, (spec	city)					
{												
	Pre-Test	Results			P	ost-Test Re	sults					
					-							
	29	.5				17.4						
Date	of Test	Number o	f Pupi	ls	Date o	f Test	Number o	f Pupils				
			•					·				
Marcl	1979	693			April	1970	765					
Mean Grade	Equivalent					de Equivale						
	3-9	a					1. 79					
							4-7					
Number of P			tegori	ខន	Number o			e Categories				
	National		<del></del>				nal Norms					
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-	99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th				
}							<b>{</b>					
	·											
198	136	207	152		239	150	203	173				
					203	130	1	1/3				
		·										
ame of Test Fo												
ame of Tes				Fo	rm Pre-Test	Form Po	st-Test	Grade				
.ame of Tes	SRA Achiev	rement Serie	es	Fo	rm Pre-Test	t	ost-Test Elue)	Grade				
	SRA Achiev Reading Vo	cabulary			D	(1		Grade 4				
ame of Tes	SRA Achiev Reading Vo	cabulary			D	(1	Elue)	Į.				
	SRA Achiev Reading Vo le I Readin	cabulary g Activity			D many as app	1y) (I	Elue) D	4				
	SRA Achiev Reading Vo le I Readin	cabulary g Activity Provided	(check	as 1	D many as app	ly) ummer Remed	Elue) D dial Readin	<b>ц</b>				
	SRA Achiev Reading Vo le I Readin  None Spec	ecabulary  R Activity  Provided  Ial Remedia	(check	as 1	D many as app SS	ly) ummer Remed	Elue) D Hial Readin	4 2g als				
	SRA Achiev Reading Vo  le I Readin  None Spec x Read	e Activity  Provided  ial Remedia  ing Consult	(check	as 1	nany as app $ \begin{array}{cccc}  & & & \\  & \times & & \\  & \times & & \\  & \times & & \\ \end{array} $	ly) ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lit	Elue) D Hial Reading Materiorary Facil	4 2g als				
	SRA Achiev Reading Vo  le I Readin  None Spec x Read	ecabulary  R Activity  Provided  Ial Remedia	(check	as 1	nany as app $ \begin{array}{cccc}  & & & \\  & \times & & \\  & \times & & \\  & \times & & \\ \end{array} $	ly) ummer Remed	Elue) D Hial Reading Materiorary Facil	4 2g als				
	SRA Achiev Reading Vo  le I Readin  None Spec x Read	e Activity  Provided  ial Remedia  ing Consult	(check	as 1	nany as app $ \begin{array}{cccc}  & & & \\  & \times & & \\  & \times & & \\  & \times & & \\ \end{array} $	ly) ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lit	Elue) D Hial Reading Materiorary Facil	4 2g als				
	SRA Achiev Reading Vo  le I Readin  None Spec x Read	e Activity  Provided  ial Remedia  ing Consult	(check	as 1	nany as app $ \begin{array}{cccc}  & & & \\  & \times & & \\  & \times & & \\  & \times & & \\ \end{array} $	ly) ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lit	Elue) D Hial Reading Materiorary Facil	4 2g als				
	SRA Achiev Reading Vo  le I Readin  None Spec x Read	e Activity  Provided  ial Remedia  ing Consult  ther Aides	(check	as 1	D many as app	ly) ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lit	Elue) D dial Reading Materiorary Facil	4 2g als				
	SRA Achiev Reading Vo  le I Readin  None Spec x Read x Teac  Pre-Test	e Activity  Provided  ial Remedia  ing Consult  ther Aides	(check	as 1	D many as app	ly)  ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lib ther, (spec	Elue) D dial Reading Materiorary Facil	4 2g als				
Type of Tit	SRA Achiev Reading Volume I Reading Volume I Reading Volume I Reading Volume I Reading	ecabulary  g Activity  Provided  ial Remedia  ing Consult  ther Aides  Results	(check	as i	D many as app  S X S X E O	ly)  ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lik ther, (spec	dial Reading Materiorary Facil	g als ities				
Type of Tit	SRA Achiev Reading Vo  le I Readin  None Spec x Read x Teac  Pre-Test	e Activity  Provided  ial Remedia  ing Consult  ther Aides	(check	as i	D many as app	ly)  ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lik ther, (spec	dial Reading Materiorary Facil	4 2g als				
Type of Tit	SRA Achiev Reading Volume I Reading I	Provided ial Remediating Consult ther Aides  Results  Number of	(check	as i	D many as app  S X E O  Date o	ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lik ther, (spec	dial Reading Materiorary Facilatify)  esults	g als ities				
Type of Tit  Date  March	SRA Achiev Reading Volume I Reading I	ecabulary  g Activity  Provided  ial Remedia  ing Consult  ther Aides  Results	(check	as i	D many as app  S X E O  Date o	ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Likther, (special Read ther, (special Read ther, for the second seco	Blue) D  Hial Reading Hateri brary Facil cify)  Esults  Number controls 765	g als ities				
Type of Tit	SRA Achiev Reading Volume I Reading I	Provided ial Remediating Consult ther Aides  Results  Number of	(check	as i	D many as app  S X E O  Date o	ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lik ther, (spec	Blue) D  Hial Reading Hateri brary Facil cify)  Esults  Number controls 765	g als ities				
Type of Tit  Date  March	SRA Achiev Reading Volume I Reading Volume I Reading Volume I Reading Volume I Reading	Provided ial Remediating Consult ther Aides  Results  Number of	(check	as i	D many as app  S X E O  Date o	ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Likther, (special Read ther, (special Read ther, for the second seco	dial Reading Materiorary Facilities  Number of 765	g als ities				
Date  March  Mean Grade	SRA Achiev Reading Volume Television None Special Reading X Reading X Reading X Teach  Pre-Test 20.  of Test 1969 Equivalent	Provided ial Remedialing Consult ther Aides  Results  Number 69	(check	as i	D many as app  S X S X E O  Date o  April Mean Gra	ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lik ther, (special ost-Test Read 15.9 f Test	dial Reading Materiorary Facilating Materiorary Facilating Materiorary Facilating Mumber of Testing Mu	g als ities				
Type of Tit  Date  March	Pre-Test 20.  of Test 1969 Equivalent	Provided ial Remediating Consult ther Aides  Results  Number of 69	(check	as i	D many as app  S X S X E O  Date o  April Mean Gra	ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lik ther, (special rest Rest) 0st-Test Rest 15.9 f Test	esults  Number of 765  ent  4-8	g als ities				
Date  March  Mean Grade	Pre-Test 20.  of Test left left left valent  valent  left left left left left left left le	Provided ial Remediating Consult ther Aides  Results  Number of 69  3-7  Freentile Cannot be a consult to the c	(check	as i	D many as app  S X S X E O  Date o  April Mean Gra  Number o	ummer Remedial Read Read Read Read Read Read Read Read	elue)  D  dial Reading Material Facility  esults  Number of 765  ent  4-8  y Percentil and Norms	g als ities  of Pupils  e Categories				
Date  March  Mean Grade	Pre-Test 20.  of Test left left left valent  valent  left left left left left left left le	Provided ial Remediating Consult ther Aides  Results  Number of 69	(check	as i	D many as app  S X S X E O  Date o  April Mean Gra	ummer Remedial Read Read Read Read Read Read Read Read	esults  Number of 765  Pent 4-8  Percentil al Norms	g als ities  of Pupils  e Categories				
Date  March  Mean Grade	Pre-Test 20.  of Test left left left valent  valent  left left left left left left left le	Provided ial Remediating Consult ther Aides  Results  Number of 69  3-7  Freentile Cannot be a consult to the c	(check	as i	D many as app  S X S X E O  Date o  April Mean Gra  Number o	ummer Remedial Read Read Read Read Read Read Read Read	elue)  D  dial Reading Material Facility  esults  Number of 765  ent  4-8  y Percentil and Norms	g als ities  of Pupils  e Categories				
Date  March Mean Grade  Number of P	SRA Achiev Reading Volume Reading Volume Reading Volume Reading Volume Reading Volume Reading	Provided ial Remedialing Consult ther Aides  Results 5  Number of 69  3-7  reentile Cannot be a first forms  51st-75th	(check al Teach ant of Pupi	as ther	D many as app  S X S X E O  Date o  April Mean Gra  Number o  Below 25th	ummer Remedial Read Read Read Read Read Read Read Read	dial Reading Material Facility)  Solution  Number of Test  4-8  Percentil Test  11-15  15-15	e Categories				
Date  March  Mean Grade	Pre-Test 20.  of Test left left left valent  valent  left left left left left left left le	Provided ial Remediating Consult ther Aides  Results  Number of 69  3-7  Freentile Cannot be a consult to the c	(check	as ther	D many as app  S X S X E O  Date o  April Mean Gra  Number o	ummer Remedial Read Read Read Read Read Read Read Read	elue)  D  dial Reading Material Facility  esults  Number of 765  ent  4-8  y Percentil and Norms	g als ities  of Pupils  e Categories				



Name of Ten	177 164 148, 113	evergale pro- (evergale pro- Obagas) read	ici Te	Ed ( A. Web busy	Torrest Contespond		1 100 22 12 Verde 5 www Averego		
pe of Tit	Rona Spac St. Rond	d Activity Provided Int Remadia Int Commuta her Aides	d Tonehoy	Survey Ecodial Reading  E Special Reading Enterials  E Papareled Library Facilities  Other, (opecily)					
	fre-Yest	Rosults		Post-Yest kenults					
	3.7.	3 '			21.1				
Date	of Test	Rusher o	f Pupils	Date of Test Number of Pup			f Pupils		
Fare	h 1969	84	7	April	. 1370	96	4		
Baan Grade	Equivalent			Mean Gra	de Equivale	int			
	4	G				5-6			
	Natifican).	Romas Fotol	Gd. 5	Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories Patienal HormaTotal CC, 5 Lalex 25th 26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th					
201	278	୧୦୭	184	283	286	230	262		
	t SRA Actic Reading Vo	ocabulary		D Form fost-Test Grade 5 (blue) D Low - Average many as apply)					
	Spec x Read	Provided inl Roundic ing Consult her Aides		Sucrer Remadial Reading  x Special Reading Natorials  x Expanded Library Facilities Other, (specify)					
and which had arrest the state of the enterprising the factors of the state of the	Pre-lest	Results		Post-Test Hesults					
	1:	•							
Date	of Test	Number o	of fupils	20.8 Date of Test Number of			f Pupils		
Farch	Farch 1989 844			April 1970 963			33		
Fean Grade	Equivalens	-7	aparatura dua era propostariorem success	Mean Grade Equivalent					
Employ of f	Bactorial	Hoves	-		Natifor	asl Pores	c Categories		
203	217	225	197	257	285	249	252		



VI. OBJECTIVE CH	RVCY				ŗ.	19,000 AB 1	
	Jewes Bugster				(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	Table B	
The of With I heading	; Autivity (co.ch :	: .: 11	nng so appl	5)			
None Speci	lal Recedial Acade Ing Compulteat	Server levelled Reading  Special heading Retariate  Fig. 64d Albrery Facilities  Other, (specify)					
Pre-Yest 1	Regulte:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ost-Tent Ro	su) te	naan marka saaranna marka saara		
21.0				21,4			
l	Runder of Pupils		Date of	Tent	Number of	Pupils	
March 1909	25		Aprisil	1970	27		
Mean Grade Equivalent	, angun binarish kulonga karangan ingan sibar tuan sakar tuan sibar tinan sakar tuan kalangan sakar sakar saka		Marin Gras	le Equivale	tit	ann an marieda, a an deid hau tha a the an least e think a de a t	
5-	-7				6-9		
Number of Pupils by Per National 1	1*	3		11.00 1 100	with Mostrice		
Below 25th Zoth-50th	51ac-75th   76th-90	(Eh)	Lalos 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	
			·				
By a player to dear and are given an over the first of the contract of the	and the state of t		e compression and a con-				
1	lovement Series Vocabulary	ror	m (Silve) D	Form (Gr	nst-Test cen) D	Grade 5 Advanced	
Type of Title I Reading	g Activity (check a	Cis D	way as typ	15)	and the property of the second		
None Spc.c.  x Read  x Teac	er	Survey Ranadial Reading  N Special Reading Materials Expanded Library Facilities Other, (specify)					
f'se-Tess	Results		Fost-Test Results				
84.		26.1					
Date of Yest	Number of Pupil	5	Date o	f Test	Number o	f Pupils	
March 1969.	25		Apvil	1 1970	2	27	
Noan Grade Equivalent 6-		Monu Grade Equivalent 7-7					
1		Number of Empfly by Percentile Categories					
Rationed	5) ne-75th 76ch 9	(5 <u>c</u> ).	591, W J. 1883	Partio	ngl Norwa   51:st-75th	76th-99th	
<u> </u>				L	L.,		



VII.	OBJECTIVE	SURVEY		Paye 30 /				
House of Jer	GUA Aridi Perdinji G	na na kali da k Kali Kali da kali Majar Makarana ka	. 10	1.4 ( 5.5 ( 5.7 ( ) ) ( 5.8 .) D	102	er vent	Grade 6	
97 61 VI.	De F Resdi			ray er epp.			Eliginalia mananga padamilingga padahasa sa sa sa	
1	Alone Spine M Road	Proclica dal henedic dag Censuli day Aldes	d Toricher	Surmay Resident Rending  y Special Berding Miturials  Empanded Labrary Lactifities  Other, (specify)				
an and a second professional and a second profession a	Fre-Tent	Reculis		Pe	ost-Yest F	sulto		
	1/	i Č			3.7 . 4			
Date	of Yest	Kulaber c	of Pupils	*		Number c	of Puptis	
Man	ch 1989	9	65	April	1620	. 3	11.	
	Equivalent	[			da Equivalo	int	مودائم سے فیستان احد نہیے پینٹونٹو کا طبق نہا ت	
	Ą	.0	,			4-7		
	Pupils by Pe	romtile Ca	Grada 6		Notifice.	Percentil	lende 8 trata	
helou 25th	26ch-Such	5151-75th	51st-75th 76th-99th		26th-50th	51st-75t1	h   76Lh-99cl	
			·	-				
255	193	274	210	275	2.25	288	274	
ana kata na ili manganananan panah ang manah manggapa	Space x Read	ocabulary	(check as a		ly) unmar Remod pocial Remo	D ital Readir ding Nateri orany Tacil	als	
	Pre-Tost	Recults	To Comment the Control of the Contro	Post-Test Results				
angungan barangan sakar berasakan gaga	13,	,5		16.5				
Date	of Yest	Number o	ri Pupils	Date of	f Test	Number o	of repils	
	ch 1.969	20	: :	April 1970 E11			1.1	
Mean Grade	Equivalent		•	Masm Grada Equivalent				
ı	,	· <u>4</u>	the second s	4.9				
		The second of th	Runber of Pupils by Forcentile Conagories Ruthers North Total Cruis S Fig. 180 75th 26th-50th   Fire-75th   File-95th				a Catogoria	
	Supile by fo						lobel Grain	
	Supile by fo						Cabal Grain	
	Supile by fo						Cotal Grein   76th-Earl     275	

The of Title I Padding Activity (chick to namy to apply) Success Foundful Reading

Special Founding Materials

Expended Missery Facilities Rona Provided Special Revedial Teacher x Reading Consultrat
x Teacher Aides x Yeacher Aides Other, (specify) Pre-Test Ragults Post-Test Regults 23.5 22.2 Date of Test Number of Supils Date of Yest Number of Pupils Murch 1989 April 1970 848 Hean Grade Equivalent Mean Grade Equivalent 6--2 Number of Papila by Percentile Categories Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories Mational Forms Patienal Borms Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th Falow 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-v9th in of Test SRA Achievement Series Yorm, fost-Tast (Green) Fore Sugrent Grade 0 Average to Reading Vocabulary **)**) Advinced Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply) \_\_\_\_ Surwer Readdish Readding \_\_\_\_ None Provided N Special Reading Materials Special Remodial Teacher X Reading Consultant X Expanded Idbuary Facilities
Other, (specify) x Teacher Aides Pre-Test Results fost-lest Results 24.1 24 Rumber of Pupils Date of Test Date of Test Rumber of Pupila Arasil 1970 March 1969 Mean Grade Equivalent Maan Grade Equivalent

To his the special of the peakeness.

Pare 31 .

VIII. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Wh. a of Test SPA Actions in Profession

Rending Comprehension

6-3

Entional Royan

Rusber of Supile by Percentific Seregories | Englance of English by Fare wifes Ortegories

rease 25 to 1 2 sch-lock | 5 to 1 - Zould | Zould State State | 25 to 1 25 to 1 5 to 1 5 2 A - Zoub | 75 to 1 25 to

# COMPLUSION

This extensive study of 3,500 children participating in the Title I program consisted of varying levels of instruction at each grade level. The reading scores are an indication of the success of the program. At every grade level the reading scores improved and other reading content programs showed an improved record of performance.



# State Evaluation Target Area #5

In this target area approximately 9,195 children were included in the objective analysis to determine the progress under the Title I project. The data indicates the grade levels examined in the pre- and post-testing.

# SUMMARY OF DATA

#### I. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Te	est Pre Post	Gates-Mac	Ginitie	Form :	Pre-Test	Form Pos	st-test	Grade		
				Pre-r	eading	Α -	- Z	1.		
Pre-test Results					Post-test Results					
Date of Te	est	Number	of Pupils	Date	e of Test	Nur	Number of Pupils			
None		60		5-70 60						
Mean Grade	e Equival	ent			Mean Grade 1	Equivalen	t			
Non-re	eader				•	1.61				
II. OBJ	ECTIVE SU	RVEY		L		T		1		
Name of Te	est Pre Post	Gates-Mac		Form Pre-Test For B 1		Form Pos B :		Grade 2		
Pre-test 1	Results			Post-test Results						
Date of Te	est	Number o	of Pupils	Date	e of Test	Nur	Number of Pupils			
9-69		43		5-70 43						
Mean Grade Equivalent					Mean Grade Equivalent					
1.37					2.39					
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categor National Norm				ries Number of Pupils by Percentile Categor National Norm						
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th		Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th		
28	13	2	0		22	16	5	0		



Name of Tes	3 t			l'o:	m Pre-Test	Form	ost-Test	Grade	
Clyson-B	arrett Pre-	reading But	teny		Α			Kindergarten	
	le I Readir			a3 i	many as app	<u>ly)</u>	<del></del>		
	Sper Read	Provided Hal Remedia Hing Consult Ther Aides		er	<u> </u>	pecial Reaxpanded L	edial Readi ading Mater brary Fact ccify) oral Visi	ials lities	
	Pre-Test	Results			P	ost-Test	lesults	N Trade-Proposition and Address and Addres	
Date	of Test	Number o	of Pupil	8	Date of Test Number of Pupils				
May 11-1	5 1970	1,3	ŭП						
	Mean Grade Equivalent				Mean Gra	de Equiva	lent		
No norms	for G.E.			}					
	upils by Pe	rcentile Ca	itegorie	s	Number o	f Pupils	y Percenti	le Categories	
Ralow 25th	National 26ch-50ch		76+5 0	553	Palan 25AV		onal Norms	h   76th-99th	
83	119	303	879	7511	UD CZ WOTBU	20En-30E	1 3150-730	n 70011-39011	
		303	6/9						
264	235	268	617						
i e of l'es	· +	·		Eas	rm Pre-Test	town	Post-Test	Grade	
				roi	tm Fre-lest	roim	ost-lest	Grade	
<u> </u>	itan Readine le I Readin		(ab a ala		A			1	
	None  X Spec	Provided ial Remedia ing Consult	ıl Teach		$\frac{x}{x}$ S $\frac{x}{x}$ E	ummer Remo pecial Rea xpanded La	edial Readi ading Mater brary Faci ecify) oral	ials lities	
	Pre-Test	Regults			P	ost-Test	Resulta		
}	. 10 100	NCS WILLS			* `	ose rese	(CSUICS		
Date	of Test	Number o	of Pupilo	8	Date o	f Test	Number	of Pupils	
Sept. 8,	1970	1,77	74	Ì					
Mean Grade	Equivalent	<u> </u>			Mean Gra	de Equiva	lent		
No	norms for	G.E.							
Number of f	upils by Pe National		tegorie	S	Number o	•	y Percenti onal Norms	le Categories	
E	D	C B	A		Below 25th		51st-75t	h 76th-99th	
, 36 7 2	284 24	727 532 38 24			00% (Nat'l				
	16	41 30	1 11		00% (Local	orms)			



# V. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Page 25

Name of Tes	t		Fo	rn Pre-Test	Form Po	ost-Test	Grade
Lowa Tes	ts of Basic	Skills		3			6
Fope of Tit	le I Readin	g Activity	(check as	many as app	lÿ)		
	Spec Read	Provided ial Remedia ing Consult her Aides	il Tracher ant	S:	ummer Romed pecial Read xpanded Lib ther, (spec	ling Materi Prary Facil	als
	Pre-Test	Results		P	ost-Test Re	osulrs	
					ose rese m		
}	of Test		f Pupils	Date of Test Number of Pupils			
October 1		1,5	559	Wa == Cara	Jan 12 - 1 - 1 - 1		يت ويتا المحادث والمحادث المحادث المحادث المحادث والمحادث والمحادث والمحادث والمحادث والمحادث والمحادث والمحادث
mean Grade	5.08			mean Gra	de Equivale	±11L	
Number of F	o.08 Pupils by Pe National	rcentile Ca	itegories	Number o		y Percentii	le Categories
Below 25th			76th-99th	Below 25th			1 76th-99th
833	407	217	92			<u></u>	
me of Tes	. <del>.</del>		) ×	orm Pre-Test		ost-Test	
i he or les	, L			orm rre-lest	roim Po	ost-lest	Grade
Type of Tit	None Spec	g Activity Provided ial Remedia ing Consult her Aides	ıl Teacher	S	ly) ummer Remed pecial Read xpanded Lil ther, (spec	ding Mater brary Facil	lals
	Pre-Test	Results		P	ost-Test Re	esults	
	·						
Date	of Test	Number o	of Pupils	Date o	f Test	Number (	of Pupils
Mean Grade	Equivalent			Mean Gra	de Equivale	ent	
L	Pupils by Pe National	Norms			Natio	nal Norms	le Categories
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75tl	76th-99th



e of file I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)    X None Provided   Special Reading Activity (check as many as apply)	Name of Tes	<b>C</b>			For	m Pre-Test	Form Po	ost-Test	Grade	
X   None   Provided   Special   Reading   Special   Sp	Metrop	olitan Upper	r Primary			В			2	
Special Remedial Teacher Repaids Special Remedial Remedia	e of Tit	le I Readin	g Activity	(check a	ill til	апу да арр	ly)		and the second s	
Date of Test Number of Pupils Date of Test Number of Pupils February 24, 1970 1,512 Mean Grade Equivalent  2.69 Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms  National Norms National Norms  National Norms  National Norms  National Norms  National Norms  National Norms  National Norms  National Norms  A None of Test  Iowa Tests of Basic Skills  Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)   X None Provided  Special Remedial Teacher  Reading Consultant  Teacher Aides  Post-Test Results  Post-Test Results  Post-Test Results  Post-Test Results  Post-Test Results  Number of Pupils Date of Test Number of Pupils  October 1969 1,444  Mean Grade Equivalent  Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms		Spec Read	ial Remedia ing Consult	1 Teache ant	er	r Special Reading Materials Expanded Library Facilities				
Mean Grade Equivalent   Mean Grade Equivalent   2.69	The second secon	Pre-Test	Results	mammamama esta esta en en esperante en el esperante en esta esta en esta esta esta esta en esta esta esta esta		Pe	ost-Test R	esults		
Mean Grade Equivalent  2.69  Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms  Ralow 25th   26th-S0th   51st-75th   76th-99th   Below 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th    .ume of Test	Date	of Test	Number o	f Pupils		Date of	f Test	Number	of Pupils	
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms Relow 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th   Below 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th      Mational Norms   National Norms   National Norms	February	February 24, 1970 1,512					}			
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms Relow 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th   Eelow 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th    Soa   379   224   407   Form Pre-Test   Form Post-Test   Grade    Iowa Tests of Basic Skills   3   4    Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)    X   None Provided   Special Remedial Teacher   Reading Consultant   Expanded Library Facilities     Teacher Aldes   Teacher Aldes   Teacher   Teacher Aldes     Date of Test   Number of Pupils   Date of Test   Number of Pupils     October 1969   1,444   Mean Grade Equivalent     3   33     Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories   Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories   National Norms     Rational Norms   National Norms   National Norms     Below 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th   Below 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th     Teacher Aldes   Teacher   Teacher Aldes   Teacher Aldes	Mean Grade Equivalent					Mean Grad	de Equivale	ent		
National Norms		2	.69							
Relow 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th Eelow 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th  503 379 224 407 Form Pre-Test Form Post-Test Grade  Iowa Tests of Basic Skills 3 4  Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)  X None Provided Special Remedial Teacher Reading Consultant Expanded Library Facilities Other, (specify)  Fre-Test Results Post-Test Results  Date of Test Number of Pupils Date of Test Number of Pupils  October 1969 1,444  Mean Grade Equivalent Mean Grade Equivalent  3.33  Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories Number of Pupils by Percentile Catagories National Norms  Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th	Number of F	· -		tegorles		Number of		-	le Categories	
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills  Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)  X None Provided Special Remedial Teacher Reading Consultant Expanded Library Facilities  Reading Consultant Expanded Library Facilities  Other, (specify)  Pre-Test Results  Post-Test Results  Post-Test Results  Date of Test Number of Pupils Date of Test Number of Pupils October 1969  1,444  Mean Grade Equivalent  3.33  Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms  Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th	Relow 25th			76th-99	ch	Below 25th			h 76th-99th	
Towa Tests of Basic Skills  Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)    X None Provided	503	379	224	407						
Towa Tests of Basic Skills  Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)    X None Provided					<u> </u>					
Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)    X   None Provided   Summer Remedial Reading   Special Reading Consultant   Expanded Library Facilities   Other, (specify)					ror	m Pre-Test	Form Po	ost-Test	Grade	
X None Provided Special Remedial Teacher Reading Consultant Teacher Aides  Pre-Test Results  Date of Test Number of Pupils October 1969  Mean Grade Equivalent  3.33  Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms  Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th	L			(chack a		3	1 0)	·	4	
Date of Test Number of Pupils Date of Test Number of Pupils October 1969 1,444  Mean Grade Equivalent Mean Grade Equivalent  3.33  Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms  Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th	<ul> <li>X None Provided</li> <li>Special Remedial Teacher</li> <li>Reading Consultant</li> </ul>					Summer Remedial Reading Special Reading Materials Expanded Library Facilities				
Date of Test Number of Pupils Date of Test Number of Pupils  October 1969 1,444  Mean Grade Equivalent Mean Grade Equivalent  3.33  Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms  Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th		fre-Test	Results		7	Po	ost-Test R	esults		
October 1969  Nean Grade Equivalent  3.33  Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms  Below 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th   Below 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th	nata.			of Puntle	1	Date	f Tost	Numbar	of Punile	
Mean Grade Equivalent  3.33  Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms  Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th	Ì			•		Date 0.	ı iest	namuer	Of Inhits	
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms  Below 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th   Below 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th	<u></u>		1,4	44 	$\dashv$	Mean Grad	de Equival	ent		
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms  Below 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th   Below 25th   26th-50th   51st-75th   76th-99th	Grade		22			Oral		<u>-</u>		
Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th Below 25th 26th-50th 51st-75th 76th-99th	Number of £	upils by Pe	rcentile Ca	tegories	+	Number o	•	•	le Categories	
598 551 219 78	Below 25th			76th-99	th	Below 25th			h 76th-99th	
	598	551	219	78						

VI. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Tes	t	Bardy middle of party and		Fo	ra Pre-Test	Form Pe	out-Test	Grade
Cates	-MacGinitie				D3	ng		į,
re ne of Tit	le I Readin	g Activity	(chæck	26	many as app.			anaga asar <sup>1</sup> aa wagaanawaa aayaanaa a waanaanawa wa
	x Spec	Provided ial Remedia ing Consult her Aides		her	Σ S <sub>1</sub> × ε:	pecial Read xpanded Lil	ital Reading ling Materia prary Facill cify) Counc	ila Lties
	Pre-Test	Results			. و	ost-Test Re	esults	
Date	of Test	Number o	f Pupi	18	Date o	f Test	Number of	Pupils
9-69		62			5-70			2
Mean Grade	Equivalent				Mean Gra	de Equivale	ent	
	·	83					3.71	and the second s
Number of P	upils by Pe National		tegori	೬୫	Number o		y Percentila nal Norms	e Categories
Below 25th	26th-50th		76th-	99t'n	Below 25th		51st-75th	76th-99th
47	14	1	0		35 -	22	5	0
me of Tes	t			Fo	rm Pre-Test	Form P	ost-Test	Grade
Gate	s-MacGiniti	e			C l	c	2	3
Type of Tit	× Spec	g Activity Provided ial Remedia ing Consult her Aides	ıl Teac		S x S x E	ummer Reme pecial Rea xpanded Li	dial Reading ding Materials brary Facilacify) Couns	als ities
	Pre-Test	Results			P	ost-Test R	esults	والمساور والمراوية والمساورة والمساو
Date	of Test	Number o	of Pupi	18	Date o	f Test	Number o	f Pupils
9-6	9	51			5-70		51	
Mean Grade	Equivalent					de Equival		
	1.9	8					2,72	
Number of P	upils by Pe		tegori	es	Number o	-	y Percentil	e Categories
Below 25th	National 26th-50th	Norms 51st-75th	76th-	99th	Below 25th		nal Norms   51st-75th	76th-99th
40	10	0	0	0	31	17	2	0



PAROCHIAL

VII.	OPUNCTIVE	CURVERY					Property.
Name of	Test Pro C Post_	pton-MorC	inten Fo	m Pre-Test D 3		n Post Test D 2	Grode 4
Tirnof I	Title I Read	ing Activity	(check as r	napy as ap	ply)	i ran — 4 Samin karagan dangkang ba <u>bu, benggula mang, m</u> erubah	ayyan gilan uyu girgayyalin va Jasanu na dirinani aka satesal
·	<u> </u>	Reading C	modial Tead onsultant	her x Specie	ul Roarlin		
anga antang ayang gasarba sa gipi kacama aya ay ay ayang ayang garang an ayan ayan ay	موساسو المرافق والمرافق المرافق والمرافق والمرافق والمرافق والمرافق والمرافق والمرافق والمرافق والمرافق والمرافق والم	_Teacher A	ides		ded Libra 	ry Facilitie	S,
Pre-Test	Results			Post-Iest	Renults		
Date of 1	)	Number of	Pupils	Date of Test Number of Pupils 5-70 17			
Mean Gr	ade Equival			Moan C	rade Equ	ivalent 4.78	
"Tations"	Marn		Categories	Mattagat	1° 0 ~ m		
Below 20	26=5011	51-75th	75-2005	Belon: 25	25-50th	51-75%	
5	11	I	0	0	14	3	0
Name of	Test Ivo C	kates-Mac()	Enitie Form	n Pro-test C 1	Torm Po	est-test 2	Grade 3
Type of	X_Read: X_Read:	ing Activity provided ial Remodin ing Concult her Aides		Summ Speci Expa:	ier Remed Ial Readii	ital Reading ng Material: ary Facilitie (y)	s
Pre-test	Results			Post-te	st Result	s	
Date of '	Test	Number o	f Pupils	Date of T	1	Number of	Pupils
Mean Gr	ade Equiva 2.01	lent		Mean G	Irade Equ	ivalent 3.85	
Number of	of Pupils by	/ Percentile	Categories	Number of	Pupils b	y Percentil	e Categories
Below 2"	5 25-50th	51-75th	75-90th	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	51-75th	76-99th
8	2	0	0	٠.	4	4	0
,		ı	,	40			



Name of Test Pre G. Post_	ttos-MacGla	ltin	Form Tro-Tos 103	10:		ost Test D2	Grade 6
Types of Mittle I Road	ing Activity	(direction	n many as an	oly)		и, шинду и одо динениции, дебаленевуще	نة و المحمد والمحمد وا
<u>.</u> 2	Non provide Shedial Rem Reading Con Cleacher Aid	rodial To rsultant	acher N. Cou <u>X.Spe</u> als	nselling A Readi	ng N		5,
Pre-Tost Results	an Minimum serie minimum dari Aria Mangalamban se Amazorda Minimum serie dari dari dari dari dari dari dari dari	erent blev 1954 i bir av pjesteriore francisco	Post-lest	Rosults	3	The second secon	
Date of Test   9-69	Date of 5-70	Date of Test Number of Pupil:					
	.44			rade Eq		5.77	
Number of Pupils by National Norm	y Porcentile C	Jatogoria	ssi Number o <u>I Vational</u>		by l	Percentile	o Categorie
3elow 2525=50th	51-75%	76-200-	1 70'07 25	25-505	<u>'</u>	51-75+>	Z5-205
24 7	0	0	12	16		3	0
x_Spec x_Read	11	(chock a Teacher	Summ  × Specific X Chipar  × Other	er Reme al Read	edial ing l	D-2  Reading Materials Facilitie	
Pre-test Results			Post-te	st Resul	lts		
Date of Test 9-69	Number of 46	Pupils	Date of T		Nu	umber of 1	Pupils
Mean Grade Equiva 3.44			Mean G	rade Eq	uiva	lent 4.64	
Number of Pupils by National Norms	y Percentile (	Categorie	Number of National	Puplls	by F	Percentile	Categorie
Below 25 26-50th	53-75th	76 <u>-995</u> 5	30low 25	<u> 25-50th</u>		51-75th	<u>  76-09th</u> 
38 8	0	0	20	19		7	0
C		Afficiación e succeso e se ser	41 -	r mari ferri femen i Agri			

	Pout Ero	Inton MagCi	witte 1 20	rm Dra Tach	Form	Post Test	Grade	
	Post_	Jates-MacCi	HILLY IV	D 3 D 2			6	
Type==f I	ttle I Read	ding Activity	(check as :	nany as app	oly)	and the second s	de minima primira i cambinada birministra	
*.,	_	Non_provid	led	Summo	er Remedi	al Reading		
	•	x Special Re			1 Dandin	. N.Co. bowles I.o.		
	-	x_Reading Co Teacher At		<u>х S</u> pecia Expand		y Facilities	,	
Pre-Test	Results	rakyst, pathirakyst (n. 1936 och til Stignstendet repathiraktika, som de trom Han på den frankris sakuses i den skynde plantförmannett opdatingsteder i	um un ferfilden unse authentifikungsammenfikadelande Filosofik (* 1. fil Mindelause (* 170 face) use mindelause (* 170 face)	Post-Test	Results	inder opprende file general in commente file (in the series) of the series of a series of the series	ps. de um deue fina fina frantskipp spekke med i 1. kalimade man strene dippenderiskepte på de sen am fina till endleret	
			management of the control of the con	- Prince on a constitution of the second	ntanta an tanàna and makadidra adily disemb	مرداحة فالاستحاب ويسترج ومسترست فاستوقعا والمتحر	and a second of the second of	
Date of Test Number of Pupils 9-69 11				Date of 7 5-70	t	Number of	Pupils	
vican Gra	nde Equiva	lent	**************************************	Mean G	rade Equi	valent		
	4.7		35" -		بالمراجعة والمراجعة	5.87	هنداندانتها والمساوم واستويده فها المراجع ليواهب أعجا	
Yumber c Yattoral	-	y Percentile	Categories	Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories				
		51-75ta	26-99th				76-99th	
8	3	0	0	4	4	3	0	
Tame of	Inst Fre Post	Gates-WacG	initie For	n Pre-test D 3	Form Po	1	Grade 5	
<del></del>	Wala I Dane	dina Ambiriba	(aireals ag		·	4	J	
~····· ~ ~ ~ ~		aing Monvity provided	toueux as i			ol Reading		
lype of I	ivon							
Type of I	x Spec	ial Remedial				g Materials		
lype of I	X Spec X Read	cial Remedial ling Consulta ther Aides				ry Facilitie	s .	
Type of I	X Spec X Read	ling Consulta			dec Libra	ry Facilitie	s .	
	x Spec x Read Teac	ling Consulta		ther	dec Libra	ry Facilitie	s	
Pre-test	x Spec x Read Tead	ling Consulta	ent	Post-tes	dec Libra , (Specify st Results	ry Facilitie		
Pre-test	x Spec x Read Tead Results	ling Consulta	Pupils	Post-tes  Date of T	dec Libra , (Specify st Results	ry Facilitie y) Number of F		
Pre-test Date of T 9-69	x Spec x Read Teac Results	ling Consulta ther Aides Number of	ent	Post-tes  Date of T	dec Libra, (Specify	Number of F		
Pre-test Date of T 9-69	x Spec x Read Tead Results	ling Consultation Aides  Number of Ident	Pupils	Post-tes  Date of T	dec Libra , (Specify st Results	Number of F		
Pre-test  Date of T  9-69  Viean Gra	x Spec x Read Tead Tead Results	ling Consultation Aides  Number of light	Pupils 13	Post-tes  Date of T  5-70  Mean G	cec Libra , (Specify st Results est	Number of F  13  valent 4.91	upils	
Pre-test  Date of T  9-69  Mean Gra  Jumber of Mational	x Spec x Read Tead Tead Results	ling Consultation Aides  Number of Ident	Pupils 13 Categories	Post-tes  Date of T  5-70  Mean G	cled Libra , (Specify st Results est rade Equi Pupils by orms.	Number of F  13  valent 4.91	upils	
Pre-test  Date of T  9-69  Mean Gra  Jumber of Mational	X Spec X Read Tead Tead Results Test	Number of Percentile	Pupils 13 Categories	Post-tes  Date of T  5-70  Mean G	cled Libra , (Specify st Results est rade Equi Pupils by orms.	Number of F  13  valent 4.91	upils Categories	

## CONCLUSION

The amount of data provided in this sampling indicates the extensiveness of the objective study for this target area. These figures establish local reading percentiles and provide a means to indicate the level of achievement at each elementary grade level. The post-tests results indicate that the children did benefit by reflecting a significant academic mean gain.



- B. Characteristics exhibited in successful Title I projects:
  - (1) There is a working relationship with a responsible advisory council which has assessed the needs of the educationally deprived segment of the community, making possible a more realistic evaluation of needs and concerns.
  - privilized child. This results in improved student attendance, and often in improved appearance of the children themselves. When parents are interested in their children's progress in Title I programs, they usually make themselves available for consultation and will give school personnel any assistance possible.

Such parental involvement has not come into being without development of a positive attitude on the part of the administrators in the State. As a result greater enthusiasm has been generated among administrators and teachers to work with parents on Title I projects.

- (3) Information concerning progress of the program as a whole is made available to the public, and individual progress of students is reported to those having a direct and personal interest in the program. The public, particularly the parents, gain knowledge of LEA efforts to provide special educational assistance in the following ways:
  - (a) Information indicating the progress and success of Title I programs is made public through local newspapers, schools newspapers, and letters.
  - (b) A special effort is made to inform parents of the progress of their children either by personal contact, by letter, or by telephone.



- (4) Data is gathered to determine program validity and, if necessary, possible modification or deletion.
  - (a) Successful components are validated with statistics.
  - (b) Unsuccessful program components have appropriate data so that the problem may be defined and studied.
  - (c) Adequate evaluation is applied to all programs and data in order to determine revelancy.
- (5) Thorough in-service training is provided for both the administrative staff and the instructional staff.
  - (a) The in-service section of the application of a successful Title I project indicates a well-planned program of continued training at predetermined times, covering specific subject areas.
  - (b) Through periodic project reviews, staff members of an effective

    Title I project are constantly reminded of the objectives of their segment of the program. During such reviews, the staff also discusses whether or not the work they are doing is making progress. If it is not accomplishing its objectives, they will then consider an early revision of the project.
- (6) Eligible children are identified by name on the basis of the criteria on page 1, item 4, of the application. Any additional participants are identified according to individual need and also by name.
  - (a) The children identified by criteria on page 1, item 4, of the application are named by the project director and the Title I staff involved. Supportive data are available to substantiate the total number of deprived. This listing and information is confidential information.



- (b) Generally the target school areas do not include all the children identified on page 1, item 4, of the application. Therefore, the number served will be less than the total indicated on page 1, item 4.
- (c) If children who do not qualify on an economically or educationally deprived basis are included, an appropriate rationale is given to support their participation.
- (7) The project is concentrated on those students demonstrating the greatest need. The program is built around those needs and designed to meet the many needs of the concentrated number, rather than expanded to include additional students on a more narrow range of needs.
  - (a) The deprived students identified as participants are known personnally by staff members.
  - (b) The relationship is such that proper assessment of the academic and social deficiencies can be determined.
  - (c) The needs of the most needy are provided for before additional students are added to the program.
- C. Evidence of effectiveness of projects related to cost:

There is no hard evidence that the effectiveness of Title I projects is related to costs on a State basis. However, evidence provided by some of the LEA's shows conclusive improvement in the performance of target area children in various curricular areas and it may be assumed that this improvement is the result of the expenditure of Title I dollars. But to assign a specific dollar value to improvement or lack of improvement in all projects in the State would be a very difficult proposition and would



State Evaluation Report

be of doubtful validity and reliability with our present technical capabilities.

In general, it is felt that additional money spent upon each Title I child, given comparability, is resulting in the improvement of the educational lot of these children whether or not the cost-effect relationship can be quantified at this juncture in the program.



State Evaluation Report

Page 46

- V. Effect of Title I programs on administrative structure and educational practices of SEA, LEA, and nonpublic schools:
  - A. SEA On the State level, the Title I program has been separated from the Equal Educational Opportunity (Title IV) program, formerly the Community Relations Division, and placed in the Federal Projects

    Division under the Director of the Federal Projects Division, who is responsible for the coordination of Title I programs. This division is responsible to the Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Finance. Also, the Title I staff of consultants has been augmented, although not sufficiently to perform all of the activities necessary to accelerate improvement in the quality of the Title I programs.

More effective use of the curriculum specialists in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction has been accomplished through the routing of applications to these specialists for comment and visitation. More effort has been made to coordinate with other federal programs targeted upon the educationally disadvantaged in the areas of special education, vocational education, and teacher training.

B. LEA - In most LEA's the duty of organization, planning, coordinating, administering, and evaluating Title I programs has been given to a special staff member to provide greater concentration of effort on Title I.

At this stage in the development of Title I, less emphasis is being placed upon materials and equipment and more upon programs. In some LEA's more supportive services are being included in their Title I programs, while in others these services are being provided through local effort and Title I funds are concentrated on educational activities, particularly reading. In this area greater program sophistication is noted.



State Evaluation Report

While several LEA's have had a high degree of parental participation in their Title I programs in the past, and others to a lesser extent, plans are being made by most LEA's to increase parental participation in the administrative mechanism of their program.

C. Nonpublic schools— There is no evidence that Title I has changed the administrative structure of nonpublic schools except that in most LEA's where nonpublic schools are located, nonpublic school personnel is consulted in the development and operation of those elements of the Title I program which are to be extended into the nonpublic schools.



# VI. Additional efforts to help the disadvantaged:

- A. No State funds have been appropriated specifically for compensatory education programs except for Special Education for the handicapped. These funds are distributed to LEA's which conduct Special Education classes on a pro-rata excess cost formula basis. During the 1969-70 school year, State funds in the amount of \$4,373,394.80 were distributed to LEA's to support Special Education classes for 59,442 handicapped children. The total cost of the Indiana Special Education program was \$18,876,600.00.
- B. An outstanding example of the coordination of Title I funds with other federally funded programs is that of the M.S.D. of Wayne Township Joint Services and Supply Project. This project for seriously handicapped children involves the joint efforts of 10 school corporations located west of Indianapolis. In addition to Title I funds, funds from the following federal sources are used in the project: Title II ESEA, Title III ESEA, Basic Adult Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, School Lunch, and Vocational Education.

Practically every Indiana LEA uses other federally funded programs in connection with their Title I projects, though these funds are not specifically set out in the Title I projects except in the part of the program description concerning coordination with other federally funded programs. The other federally funded programs most often mentioned in the program descriptions are the following: Title II ESEA, Title III NDEA, School Lunch, and Vocational Education.



State Evaluation Report

Page 49

# VII. Compensatory education brought to nonpublic schools through Title I:

Public and nonpublic school cooperation in regard to Title I projects in Indiana has been excellent. In all corporations having nonpublic schools, the authorized LEA Title I representative or director conferred with officials of nonpublic schools in regard to project planning, implementation, and evaluation.

The SEA emphasized by personal discussions and by written communications that nonpublic officials should be involved early in Title I program planning. When reviewing an application submitted from a project area in which nonpublic schools were located, the SEA made certain that nonpublic school officials had been given the opportunity to participate if they so desired.

In Indiana, 4,883 pupils from 59 nonpublic schools participated in Title I projects. These were instructional and supportive projects; mainly reading, mathematics, language arts, psychological and testing services, and health and guidance.

The nonpublic school pupils attended both regular term and summer classes in the public schools. These classes were held during daytime school hours.

Occasionally, because of special needs, instructional and supportive services were conducted in nonpublic schools.

Data on pre- and post-achievement testing were collected as an aggregate and not separately reported for public and nonpublic school children.

Participation or nonparticipation of nonpublic school children Title I projects has never been challenged. There has been no litigation, nor has there been any reason for new or revised legal interpretation.

In regard to joint planning of a Title I project, public and nonpublic schools of a target area have cooperated to include in the project those components which would be most helpful in solving problems common to both systems. This has resulted in very effective Title I programs.



# VIII. Coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs conducted by LEA's:

According to the Title I applications and evaluations, nearly all LEA's having Title I projects conducted in-service training. The extent of this training depended largely on the size of the program, the number of people involved, and the experience of the staff. The number of participants in these training programs totaled 6,740.

The general pattern of activities consisted of meetings prior to the beginning of the Title I programs with emphasis on familiarization with audiovisual materials, production of instructional materials, and staff orientation of LEA philosophy and procedures. Most of these sessions were conducted by consultants and administrative staff at the local level.

More extensive training programs took two or three weeks and were conducted by a staff of experts from Indiana universities. Some LEA's sent their staff to workshops of other LEA's or to those in neighboring states.

It is generally believed by most LEA's that in-service training is a continuous process and meetings are held regularly (once or twice a week) to share experiences and methods of handling current problems.

The SEA has provided guidance for the LEA's in staff training. Six panel discussion meetings were conducted by the SEA in various parts of the State last year. State Title I staff members are frequently asked to participate in the LEA's in-service training meetings and to address teachers and parents at their meetings.

The following Volunteer Teacher Aide program is an example of an effective and well-planned Title I teacher - teacher aide training program. This plan of selecting and training teacher aides has been developed by the Metropolitan School District of Decatur Township. Marion County. Indiana. Excellent training materials and guides have been prepared for the Volunteer Teacher Aides to use in their work with Title I children.



# METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DISTRICT OF DECATUR TOWNSHIP IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR VOLUNTEERS

#### Aide Program Under Title I

- A. Selection and recruitment of Volunteer Teacher Aides:
  - Volunteer Aides may have a wide background of education, ranging from very little high school work to college graduation. They may also be of any age, from young adults to people of middle age to retirement. Both men and women are involved.

Any individual interested in assisting pupils by serving as a Volunteer Teacher Aide is instructed to contact the Title I Coordinator.

The Title I Coordinator receives Volunteers through the following contacts:

- (1) Patrons who call a school principal and indicate willingness to help.
- (2) Patrons who are contacted by the principal or other school personnel to serve as members of the Volunteers.
- (3) Parents of disadvantaged pupils who are enrolled in the program.
- (4) Individuals who make inquiry in response to local newspaper articles written about the Volunteer Aide Program. Additional information is carried in the school corporation bulletin that goes to all taxpayers.
- (5) Individuals who respond to publicity and public relations by P.T.A. organizations. Churches and community service clubs assist in giving information about the program.
- B. Placement and training of Volunteer Teacher Aides:

Each Volunteer indicates a preferance for an elementary building and is then assigned in that building to the classroom teacher who has requested the services of a Volunteer Aide. Through cooperative planning, the Title I



Coordinator and the Principal plan the placement of Volunteer

Teacher Aides to best meet the needs of pupils within each building.

Initial in-service sessions consisting of approximately 12 hours of instruction per Aide are arranged for small groups, or they may be held on an individual basis for each building. Demonstrations and return practice demonstrations instruct the Aide in basic procedures and in the use of language masters, tape recorders with listening stations, record players, film strip projectors, overhead projectors, and any other specific equipment that might be used in the instruction. These sessions are scheduled for 2 or 3-hour periods and for as many times as are necessary to accommodate the Volunteers.

Specific additional instruction periods of 4 to 6 hours each are given those Aides who are to assist pupils in motor perceptual activities. On-going instruction for the Teacher Aide is available through the Title I Coordinator at the request of the Volunteer Aide, the Principal, or the classroom teachers.

The Volunteer Aides report to their assigned building on a prearranged regularly scheduled basis depending upon the time they are available. As an example, Volunteer Aide Mrs. Martin might report to classroom teacher Mr. Jones for the purpose of helping Terry X. with his schoolwork, from 9:30 to 10:30 on Monday of each week. The classroom teacher will determine what activity or extra practice Terry might need and will prepare any materials needed, placing instructions in a centrally located file box for Volunteer Aide Mrs. Martin to follow in assisting Terry. Should the Aide need further assistance, she will request it, but otherwise she will



be able to complete the activity and relay any message to the teacher either verbally or by leaving written correspondence in the file box.

### C. Regulations governing the Volunteer Aide program:

A Volunteer will not be assigned a pupil in the class grouping where her own child is in attendance. She may be assigned to another room within the building.

Part of the initial in-service training period is devoted to a discussion of the student's right to expect confidential treatment in relation to individual learning problems. Individual student problems are not carried beyond the school.

It is important to maintain the established schedule if at all possible, but if it becomes necessary to cancel a session, the school must be notified as early as possible.

General meetings which involve all Volunteer Aides are kept to a minimum because of the difficulty of all Aides to attend at one time. However, at least one mass meeting a year is held to bring all Aides together and offer new information about meeting the needs of disadvantaged students. An additional purpose for this meeting is to express appreciation for the tremendous contribution being made to the education of these students.

Assignments must avoid any initial teaching activity and are to be confined to supportive types of functions.



# D. Results of the Volunteer Aide program:

Most Volunteer Aides are better satisfied if they come directly in contact with pupils. assisting them to practice arithmethic and reading as opposed to auxiliary choices of paper checking, mimeographing, etc., although a very few request and are assigned these chores.

Experience has indicated that the service of the Volunteer

Teacher Aides is of superior quality, since it is motivated by an intense desire to serve pupils. It has been noted, also, that there is a very low attrition rate among Volunteers and a remarkable devotion to maintaining a constant schedule with the pupil.



### IX. Community and parent involvement in Title I programs in Indiana:

A. Title I programs worked with and were supplemented by Federal programs, organized groups, business and industry, and individuals. Outstanding examples of cooperation and involvement were shown by Head Start, Community Action Agencies, Neighborhood Youth Corps, volunteer aides and tutors, and Community Health and Welfare Services.

The SEA has put emphasis on the involvement of various segments of the community, utilizing all the resources such groups have to offer. It may be estimated that at least 95% of Indiana LEA's have community and parental involvement to a greater degree than expressed in their evaluations and applications. This was found to be true when SEA staff members visited schools to see Title I programs in operation.

In the past, parent involvement has consisted mainly of parentteacher conferences, teachers reporting to the parents, and parents attending open house. There is a definite trend toward changing to more active parent participation. The use of parents may be summarized:

- (1) Parents served on planning committees regarding Title I programs.
- (2) Parents were used as volunteer aides and tutors.
- (3) Parents watched their children participate in class activities.
- (4) Parents accompanied their children to speech therapy and special training sessions.
- (5) Parents accompanied children on field trips and other cultural enrichment activities.
- (6) Extensive home visit programs were conducted by parents, teachers, social workers and nurses.



(7) Parents came into the classroom to demonstrate skills and customs of other cultures, such as glass blowing, wood carving, folk singing and folk dancing, weaving, candlemaking and cheesemaking.

The following are examples of community and parent involvement as described by LEA's.

\* \* \* \*

In one Indiana school parents staged a teach-in. For one period each week over a span of several months they used their talents to instruct pupils on the fourth grade level. Results have been exhilerating to both parents and children.

The principal commented. "We are having more parent participation in the school than ever before. The participation does not create troubles—it creates understanding. Parents realize teachers have problems, that their children are not angels."

Children voluntarily gave up the morning recess period to participate in the program, which was carried out at very little expense. The children were given a choice of subjects: woodworking, art, model cars, dramatics, knitting, Latin, German, first aid and sewing. They were taught by parents who had a considerable knowledge and interest in these areas.

There was a quickening of pupil interest in education. As one child expressed it, "Learning is fun."

After each session parents met to discuss their experiences so that through sharing their successes and problems they gained a better understanding of each other, of their children, and of their school community.



State Evaluation Report

Business and industry have helped by:

- 1. hiring handicapped people on a part-time basis:
- 2. participating in work-study programs:
- 3. contributing materials and supplies for projects; and
- 4. contribution of vitamins and preventive medicines (by a pharmaceutical company).

Another approach to education in an Indiana school was made possible through the contributions of Marsh Foodliners, Inc. and Brooks Foods, Inc. The project was federally funded by Title I and through Vocational Education, Disadvantaged and Handicapped programs.

This approach, called 'Ny Store," was designed for those Title I students who find present forms of education dull and unimaginative. Using the old country store concept, "My Store" was, in a sense, a vocational stimulator—a teaching device where students have actually reinforced the basics of the "three R's" by developing a grocery store.

The two businesses mentioned above delivered shelving, displays, paint and all materials needed plus a complete stock of merchandise ranging from soap to macaroni to the target school where this project took place. The students did the work and thus were allowed to create their own learning situations and relate to subject areas in which they were directly involved.

\* \* \* \*

One Indiana LEA made good use of an Education Council to help close the school-parent communications gap in Title I schools. There were three divisions of the Education Council representing the elementary school, the middle school and the high school. The members were selected by drawing names from a list of



State Evaluation Report

Page 58

Title I and other parents who had indicated that . . . elected they would serve on one of the three divisions of the Council.

The purpose of the Education Council was to help inform parents about Title 1, along with the objectives and operation of the schools, and to inform school officials of the concerns and questions which these parents had about the various phases of the school programs. The three divisions of the Education Council were scheduled to meet four or five times each year. Each meeting was important and the members knew that 100% attendance was expected.

The school administrators met with the Council. At the first meeting the members were briefed on the overall functioning of the school corporation, on the duties of the various school officials, on school finance, and on Title I and other programs for the coming year.

Later meetings were designed to allow Council members to voice some of their concerns (or those expressed by friends or neighbors) about the operation of the schools, to decide the order of priority of these concerns, and to identify supportive and non-supportive factors in the school system relating to solution of these problems. School administrators worked on high-priority problems with the benefit of the Council's suggestions.

The success of the Education Council of this LEA speaks well for the future of Education Councils as an effective means of involving Title I parents.

\* \* \* \*

